



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

*AK*

*Jo*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/182,911	10/30/98	WILKS	B 0100.9800830

JOHN R. GARRETT  
MARKISON & RECKAMP, P.C.  
P.O. BOX 06229  
WACKER DRIVE  
CHICAGO, IL 60606-0229

LM02/0922

EXAMINER

LESPERANCE, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2774

*10*

DATE MAILED:

09/22/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**09/182,911**

Applicant(s)

**Barry G. Wilks**

Examiner

**Jean Lesperance**

Group Art Unit

**2774**



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 7, 2000

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle* 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☐ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2774

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-18 are presented for examination.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over patent # 6,018,340 ("Butler et al.") in view of patent # 5,585,821 ("Ishikura et al.")

As for claim 1, Butler et al. teach a method for supporting multiple displays per drawing surface (column 4, lines 24-25), the method comprises the steps of: a) receiving capability parameters regarding a first display of the multiple displays (column 17, lines 2-33); b) substituting selected display capabilities for the capability parameters (column 10, lines 38-53); and c) providing the selected display capabilities to an operating system (column 5, lines 19-29). Accordingly Butler et al. teach all the limitations as recited in claim 1 with the exception of providing selected display which exceed display capabilities of each of the multiple displays.

However, Ishikura et al. discloses a selected display capabilities which exceed display capabilities of each of the multiple displays (column 1, lines 19-34).

Art Unit: 2774

It would have been obvious to utilize the exceeding display capabilities as taught by Ishikura et al. in the computer system disclosed by Butler et al. because this would allow the cursor to move across a plurality of display without the cursor getting out of sight.

As for claim 2, Butler et al. teach a method of claim 1 further comprises determining the selected display capabilities based on a composite of the display parameters of each of the multiple displays (column 3, lines 31-37).

As for claim 3, Butler et al. teach a method of claim 1 further comprises determining the selected display capabilities based on capabilities of a video graphics card (column 6, lines 28-39).

As for claim 4, Butler et al. teach a method of claim 1, wherein step (a) further comprises receiving the capability parameters in accordance with a system start-up (column 2, lines 24-37).

As for claim 5, Butler et al. teach a method of claim 4, wherein step (b) further comprises, in order, identifying the capability parameters as primary parameters (column 9, lines 22-34) in accordance with a first portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10); providing the capability parameters to the operating system (column 1, lines 7-17) in accordance with the first portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10); and identifying the selected display capabilities (column 9, lines 14-33) as the primary parameters (column 13, lines 4-15) in accordance with a second portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10).

As for claim 6, Butler et al. teach a method of claim 1, wherein step (a) further comprises receiving the capability parameters in response to a monitor change process (column 10, lines 20-37).

Art Unit: 2774

As for claim 7, Butler et al. teach a multiple display Fig.3 supporting module (column 5, lines 19-28) comprises: a processing module (column 5, lines 55-63); and memory operably coupled to the processing module (column 1, lines 7-17), wherein the memory includes operational instructions that cause the processing module (column 5, lines 55-63) to (a) receive capability parameters regarding a first display of the multiple displays (column 17, lines 2-33); (b) substitute selected display capabilities for the capability parameters (column 10, lines 38-53); and © provide the selected display capabilities to an operating system (column 5, lines 19-29).

As for claim 8, Butler et al. teach a multiple display supporting module of claim 7, wherein the memory further comprises operational instructions that cause the processing module to determine the selected display capabilities based on a composite of the display parameters of each of the multiple displays (column 3, lines 31-37).

As for claim 9, Butler et al. teach a multiple display supporting module of claim 7, wherein the memory further comprises operational instructions that cause the processing module to determine the selected display capabilities based on capabilities of a video graphics card (column 5, lines 3-18).

As for claim 10, Butler et al. teach a multiple display supporting module of claim 7, wherein the memory further comprises operational instructions that cause the processing module to receive the capability parameters in accordance with a system start-up (column 2, lines 24-37).

As for claim 11, Butler et al. teach a multiple display supporting module of claim 10, wherein the memory further comprises operational instructions that cause the processing module ,

Art Unit: 2774

in order to identify the capability parameters as primary parameters (column 9, lines 22-34) in accordance with a first portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10); provide the capability parameters to the operating system (column 1, lines 7-17) in accordance with the first portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10) ; and identify the selected display capabilities (column 9, lines 14-33) as the primary parameters (column 13, 4-15) in accordance with a second portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10).

As for claim 12, Butler et al. teach a multiple display supporting module of claim 7, wherein the memory further comprises operational instructions that cause the processing module to receive the capability parameters in response to a monitor change process (column 10, lines 20-37).

As for claim 13, Butler et al. teach a digital storage medium for storing operational instructions that cause a processing module to support multiple displays associated with a drawing surface (column 3, lines 55-65), the digital storage medium comprises: first storage means for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to receive capability parameters regarding a first display of the multiple displays (column 3, lines 1-11); second storage means for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to substitute selected display capabilities for the capability parameters (column 14, lines 28-43); and third storage means for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to provide the selected display capabilities to an operating system (column 1, lines 7-17).

Art Unit: 2774

As for claim 14, Butler et al. teach a digital storage medium of claim 13 further comprises means for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to determine the selected display capabilities based on a composite of the display parameters of each of the multiple displays (column 3, lines 31-37).

As for claim 15, Butler et al. teach a digital storage medium of claim 13 further comprises means for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to determine the selected display capabilities based on capabilities of a video graphics card (column 6, lines 28-39).

As for claim 16, Butler et al. teach a digital storage medium of claim 13 further comprises means for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to receive the capability parameters in accordance with a system start-up (column 2, lines 24-37).

As for claim 17, Butler et al. teach a digital storage medium of claim 16 further comprises means for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to, in order, identify the capability (column 9, 22-34) parameters as primary parameters (column 13, lines 4-15) in accordance with a first portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10); provide the capability parameters to the operating system (column 1, lines 7-17) in accordance with the first portion of the system start-up (column 3, lines 1-10); and identify the selected display capabilities (column 9, lines 14-33) as the primary parameters (column 13, lines 4-15) in accordance with a second portion of the system start-up (column 3, 1-10).

Art Unit: 2774

As for claim 18, Butler et al. teach a digital storage medium of claim 13 further comprises means for storing operational instructions that cause the processing module to receive the capability parameters in response to a monitor change process (column 10, lines 20-37) .

### *Response to Arguments*

Applicant's arguments filed 8-7-2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant has amended the independent claims to overcome the previous rejection but a new ground of rejection has been found. Therefore the rejection stands on that new ground.

### *Conclusion*

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.



Art Unit: 2774

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean Lesperance whose telephone number is (703) 308-6414. The examiner can normally be reached on from Monday to Friday between 8:00AM and 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe, can be reached on (703) 305-4709. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-6606.


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Jean Lesperance



Art Unit 2774

Date 9-21-00



RICHARD A. HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 2700